

The Reunion of Christendom

LESLIE WALKER, S.J.

THE Catholic Church has ever been solicitous about the reunion of Christendom. From that unfortunate moment in 1073 when Cerularius finally severed the East from the West, the Church has ever sought to win back her orthodox children. From that no less unfortunate day when Luther lit the torch of revolt in the West, she has ever longed for the return of her Protestant children. If it were not so she would not be an apostolic Church; nor yet would she be a Catholic Church, for she is Catholic in virtue of her obedience to Our Lord's command that she ever preach the Gospel to all nations.

Disunion, schism, arising from diversity of belief or from any other cause whatsoever, is manifestly and unquestionably the biggest and most effectual obstacle blocking the advance of Christianity. How can a man in these busy days be expected to choose not only between Christianity and Agnosticism, Rationalism, Theosophy, Buddhism, but also between the multitudinous forms of Christianity which are presented to him? How can he be expected to believe in Christ, if, instead of one Christ, there are offered to him half a dozen, varying in character from the mere "historical Jesus" to the Catholic conception of Christ as very God Incarnate? He is told that the greatest of virtues, the peculiarly Christian virtue, is the unifying bond of charity, and in practise sees before him a Christianity which cannot but appear to him as just a conglomeration of discordant and hostile sects. How can Christianity hope to convert the pagan so long as it seeks to do so by sending him missionaries who preach different Christianities, the Catholic Church one type—the true one, certainly, but this he has unfortunately to discover—the Anglican Church at least two, and the Nonconformists quite a variety, each claiming, of

The "Catholic Times" Report of the Inaugural Address Delivered at the Catholic Truth Society Conference in Leicester, September 21-26, 1921.

course, to be the true variety, and each society spending millions in order to prove it? **How can Christianity** exert an influence on the world at large, on the policy of nations, on peace and war, on questions of justice and right and duty, so long as we, Christians, present to the powers that be, not one united front, but just so many snipers?

THE DIVIDED STATE OF CHRISTENDOM

The situation is a disaster to everyone concerned. The Catholic Church suffers because of the conflicting claims which others advance and because of the immense fund of prejudice and misunderstanding that century-old schisms have generated. The schismatics lose by it because they are up against us and are divided and at war one with the other: they claim to have a message, but they don't know what it is. And the non-Christian, bewildered by the contradictory species which Christian principles seem to bring forth, and disgusted with the want of charity thus aroused, is unable to see the truth on account of the cloud of dust with which it ever seems surrounded.

What a difference it would make if Christendom should become once again united! Think of the immense zeal, at present expended on the propagation of error, which would then be devoted to the cause of truth. Think of the immense wealth at present being poured into different missionary boxes, which then would be put all into the same. Think of the enormous labor and learning at present being given to the question of who Christ was and what are the fundamentals of His teaching, which, if only men knew the very simple answer, might be devoted to a genuine advance in knowledge. If all Christians were only united in one body and drew their faith from the one Spirit, as they draw their name from one Christ and their being from one God, who could withstand them? Of a surety, as Leo XIII said, a new order of things would arise; an immediate and rapid progress would be made all over the earth, in all manner of greatness and prosperity, in the establishment of tranquillity and peace, in the promotion of studies, and in the solution of our many social and economic problems. Nay, these abundant benefits would not be confined within the

limits of civilized nations, but like an overcharged river would flow far and wide.—(Encyclical on "The Reunion of Christendom," June, 1895.)

REUNION NOT IMPOSSIBLE

The reunion for which so many Saints have prayed, so many Popes and Bishops have labored, and which the whole Christian world now begins to desire, is certainly not impossible. *How*, then, is it possible? I have promised to give the Catholic Church's own answer. As far as may be I will give it also in her own words. Pope Leo, in his Encyclical on "The Reunion of Christendom," lays down but one condition: unity of faith, a faith which shall embrace all that the Church teaches, and that shall include also the Primacy of the Roman Pontiffs, without which unity cannot be preserved. He reminds the Eastern Churches that we agree already on most other heads, differing only as to the Primacy, which their forefathers used to teach and which is imbedded in their oldest traditions. He disclaims all desire to diminish their rights, the privileges of their patriarchs, or the established ritual of any one of their Churches. "It has been, and always will be," he says, "the intent and tradition of the Apostolic See to make a large allowance in all that is right and good for the primitive traditions and special customs of every nation." Of nations more recently separated he asks how any other basis of reunion can be possible, even that of charity, "where minds do not agree in faith." The Church, he assures them, as the common mother of all, has long been calling them back to her; the Catholics of the world await them with brotherly love, that they may render holy worship to God, together with us, united in perfect charity by the profession of one Gospel, one faith and one hope. The one thing needful is that we all meet together into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.

CARDINAL VAUGHAN'S WORDS

Cardinal Vaughan, speaking at the Catholic Conference at Preston in 1894, lays down precisely the same condition. The Church "cannot accept reunion on the basis of common formularies or creeds, while each one is left

free to give to doctrines expressed in them his own meaning and interpretation. . . . Unity must be in the sense and in the soul; it must be the unity of the spirit in the bond of faith, or it ceases to be Christian unity." It must be a unity based not on the mere historical Christ but upon "Christ as a living, Divince teacher." And "it must cover and include the whole of Our Lord's teaching," even the constitution of the Church, for this was drawn up by her Divine Founder, and is altogether outside her power or authority to alter. On the other hand, the Cardinal continues, "the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adhesion to the points of discipline to be relaxed." A year later, addressing the Conference at Bristol, the Cardinal said: "I do not understand what is meant by the notion which has been put about that, of course, if England and Rome were to draw together again, the position of the Catholic clergy, and more especially that of the Bishops and of the Archbishop of Westminster, would become impossible. If it meant that upon England becoming once more united to the Catholic Church, it might be necessary or expedient for the good of religion that we, the actual Archbishop and Bishops, should efface ourselves, I have no hesitation in saying at once, gladly would we do so."

ONE THING NECESSARY

There is one thing, then, and one thing only which the Church insists upon as absolutely necessary if others are to be admitted to Catholic communion, and that is that they accept all that Christ teaches through the living voice of the Church which His Spirit indwells. There is only one possible basis of reunion: we must have all of us the same faith, the faith which Christ committed to His Apostles, and which His Church infallibly con-

serves. Granted this, most difficulties would have already disappeared, and, if any remained, it is certain that they would be unable long to withstand the earnest desire that at present possesses the souls of Catholic and non-Catholic alike.

Turning now to the practical problem, we see at once that, if difficult to solve, it is at any rate simple in nature. It reduces itself to the question: what is the best and quickest way in which to arouse Catholic faith in the intelligence and heart of those who as yet have it not, or have it only in past? Our first duty is plainly that of prayer. To this we have been constantly exhorted by those placed over us. Without it nothing can avail. We must pray at all times and in all places, privately and in public, that God will give light and grace to those that stand in need. But also we must labor in every possible way, by preaching, writing, example, to propagate the faith that God has given us.

The environment in which people in this country [England] find themselves is rapidly changing, in its religious aspect no less than in others. Men are becoming less prejudiced, more friendly toward Catholicism. Where once there was hatred and aversion, now there is interest and a readiness to learn. The old type of Protestant is fast disappearing; men are becoming ashamed of the very name. All Christians now call themselves "Catholics," thereby seeking to hide the heresy and cover the schism which their fathers have bequeathed to them, until such time as a remedy can be found.

This change in environment, of which we must needs take account, is doubtless in part due to Catholic effort, and still more to Catholic prayer, offered without intermission for centuries, and in all parts of the world. No doubt also the war has had a good deal to do with it, since it brought about an intimacy between Catholics and non-Catholics that had never existed before, and since it led men to think deeply on the mysteries that everywhere encircle them. But it is also largely due to the old Oxford movement, which gave us Newman and Manning, and which since their day has made steady progress both in extent and in the intensity of its Catholic yearn-

ing. For it has grown not merely within the Church of England so as to embrace many hundreds of its clergy and a proportionate number of the laity, but has sprung up without, amongst Nonconformists, where the desire for Catholicism and disgust with the bareness of Protestantism are expressing themselves in a variety of ways. A like movement also exists in America, in the Colonies, and in the mission fields. Dean Inge, indeed, has prophesied that the Anglo-Catholic wave has reached its zenith and will now subside, giving place to an Evangelical revival. There is, however, not the least evidence of any such subsidence, nor is Evangelicism likely to make headway, for its basis, blind faith in the Bible, is practically dead. It is not in this way that religion tends to divide today. The two alternatives now are *either* revelation whole and entire, *or* religion based on sentiment and on the love of humanity; *either* belief in a living Christ, still speaking to the world, *or* belief in no Christ at all, but just the man, Jesus, who was not God incarnate, did not redeem us, had no Divine message to give; *either* Christianity in the Catholic sense *or else* mere naturalism. Outside the Catholic Church it is toward one or other of these alternatives that all men are tending, and at a pace that is really remarkable, considering how slowly nations move as a rule. For there has been a great awakening. Men recognize now that Christianity must either be Catholic in doctrine, communion and practise, *or else* must evaporate into a nondescript religion which demands neither sacrifice nor faith.

TWO TYPES OF MIND

We have then in England today two very different types of mind to deal with. The one is moving towards us; the other is moving away. One believes scarcely anything; the other believes almost all that we believe, and has introduced most of our practises. One is in a scarcely better position than the well-meaning Jew in the days of Our Lord; the other awaits but the final light which shall reveal to him that schism is a sin, and that schism cannot well be avoided unless there be in the Church a Divinely appointed authority, a supreme and infallible head. Nay, further, those who belong to

this second class are not only more Catholic in mind, but more apostolic in spirit. They are doing their utmost to spread the faith that is growing within them, anywhere and everywhere, amongst their own folk and amongst the pagans of non-Christian lands.

Some of us, it may be, are still scandalized by certain features in this movement towards Catholicism, and would attribute it to the *simia Dei*, the ape of God, who counterfeits God's ordinances and works. "It may be so," said Cardinal Vaughan in 1894, "but, for my part, I prefer to hope and believe that we are witnessing, at least in a very large measure, an instance of the marvelous ways of Divine grace, and that, if Satan be aping God, he is outwitting himself." And again, in 1895, "We have only to view the existing movements in England (i. e., the movements toward reunion)—not merely in the Anglican, but in every religious body—to be convinced that the spirit of God is moving over the waters." It does seem to me to be of supreme importance that in our dealings with non-Catholics we should recognize and frankly acknowledge the good that is in them, and not merely seek to combat their errors. Controversy of the sarcastic and bitter type, whether in preaching or in writing, does nobody any good. We shall never convert England that way. Neither is it the way that the Church recommends.

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S ADVICE

There is no one who has done more for the conversion of England than Cardinal Wiseman, and no more competent to advise us how to proceed. This is what he says, speaking of those who within the Church of England are working for Catholic unity:

I need not ask you whether they ought to be met with any other feeling than sympathy and kindness, and offers of heart co-operation. Ought we to sit down coldly while such sentiments are breathed in our hearing, and rise not up to bid the mourners have hope? Are we who sit in the full light to see our friends feeling their way towards us through the gloom that surrounds them, faltering for want of an outstretched hand, and sit on, and keep silent, amusing ourselves at their painful efforts, or perhaps allow them to hear from time to time only the suppressed laugh of one who triumphs over their distress? God forbid. If one must err, if in mere tribute to humanity one must needs make a false step, one's fall will be the more easy when on the side of two theological

virtues, than when on the bare cold earth of human prudence. . . . If I shall have been both too hopeful in my motives, and too charitable in my dealings, I will take my chance of smiles at my simplicity both on earth and in heaven.

It is more difficult to sympathize with those that are further removed from us and are moving in the opposite direction. But we must remember that as yet this is only a tendency. The greater number of those outside the Church are probably drawn in both directions at once. They feel the power and beauty of Catholicism, but on the other hand, are drawn towards Modernism in dogma, as being, so they think, more rational. What we have to do is to lead them onward from the position in which we find them.

All truth hangs together that the Incarnation is impossible without the Trinity, and the Redemption valueless without the Incarnation. That from the Redemption grace flows whereby man is brought into touch with God, and his will strengthened, just as by revelation his intelligence is enlightened: Civilization is the product of knowledge, and salvation also proceeds from knowledge, but from a Divine knowledge, the knowledge of God, which we cannot attain with any degree of completeness or certainty unless God Himself has revealed it. And if there has been a revelation, and it is not to prove futile, there must be a means by which it is sustained without intermingling of error in the world. God acts through man, has always done so, through prophets and priests and preachers, just as Christ in healing made use of instruments, a word, a touch, a hand-grip, a little bit of clay. It is through man and through matter God operates, through the Church and through the Sacraments, as well as directly upon man's soul. Thus, starting from some point which is admitted, we may lead men on. The whole hangs together. Grant one position, and the rest is implied.

A BOND OF SYMPATHY

In dealing with the remote as well as with the near there must be always a bond of sympathy, a common standpoint, a mutual understanding. It is impossible to help another unless we are able to some extent to enter into another's position, to speak to him in his own

language, to understand his ideas and ideals, to appreciate his difficulties and doubts. Most men imagine they act rationally, and that they freely adopt or repudiate this or that tenet in religion. In reality they go whither they are led, carried away by the specious arguments that everywhere bombard them from the pulpit, the platform and the press. At heart they would be equally ready to embrace Catholicism as Modernism or Rationalism. But the Rationalist and the Modernist get at them first, and express for them in language they can understand the very doubts and difficulties with which their minds are perturbed.

Catholicism they know not, except in the travesty which 400 years of abuse has woven together, and which still lingers on even in the most impartial of minds. If once these errors and calumnies were dispelled, and truth presented in terms that the average Englishman could grasp, truth as He revealed it who knows all things, truth in all its beauty, its coherence and its strength, there is little doubt but that England would soon return to the Fold to which once she belonged.

Severing Parent and Child

ERNEST R. HULL, S.J.

From the Bombay Examiner.

THE State, having got the thin end of the wedge into education, is gradually driving it home, and extending and deepening its grip on the child. In doing so it is gradually separating the parent from the child.

The substitution of the State for the parent is not a product of any one single tendency but of several. In primitive society, before schools came into existence, the child was brought up entirely at home; and all it became was owing to the parents. By sending it even to a day-school the child is separated from the home a good part of the day; and by sending it to a boarding-school it is separated from the home the great part of the year. Thus the training of the child is now divided. Part of it remains with the parents, but the most part is relegated to the school-master. It is a balance of losses and gains depending on the respective qualities of home and school in each

case. Then secondly, the separation of child from parents, and a general dissolution of home training, has been brought about by modern conditions of life. Hence as time goes on less and less of the training of the child remains with the parents, and more and more of it goes into other hands and chiefly to the schools—and as a consequence to the State, in proportion as education is taken over more fully by the State.

We have been watching a growing tendency among parents to shelve responsibility for their children more and more on to the school; and the State is now coming forward to deprive them of the rest. The time is coming when the rising generation will know their parents merely as acquaintances, and will owe to them nothing but birth and pecuniary support. Everything else they will either pick up for themselves, or receive at the hands of Government. Even religion and morality, if taught at all, will come to them not from their parents but from the paid (or unpaid) official teachers who professionally undertake the task so far as the parents desire it.

WHO OWNS THE CHILD?

At the back of this movement in the practical order, there lies the ever-spreading socialistic notion that the child belongs not to the parents but to the State. Expounded with moderation, the up-growing idea is that though parents possess a certain natural right over and responsibility for their children, this right is not supreme, and can be overridden by the higher rights of the State over all its subjects. The State claims at least a right to see that parents fulfil their responsibilities. The State claims a right to dictate what these responsibilities are, and to enforce them even against the convictions of the parents for the common good. In case parents fail to fulfil their duties the State claims a right to withdraw the children from their control. And on the assumption that the State can do better for the children than parents, the State can assume so extensive a control that the functions of the parents are waived aside and superseded by departmental management according to a national code.

The whole of this program rests on a very plausible basis partly of fact, partly of principle. In the region of fact, it is undeniable that quite a large number of parents

are unfit or incapable of taking care of their children and bringing them up properly, and therefore in the interests of the children themselves the State ought to interfere. Secondly, the State, having command of the accumulated wisdom and experience of the country, is much more likely to develop a more efficient system of care and control than is likely to ensue from unorganized individual efforts whether in the direction of health, training or education.

The tendency, however, is an unnatural one, and is calculated to undermine certain important features of a well-constituted family, which are of the utmost necessity for the formation of character in the young, and therefore of the greatest value in view of the ultimate well-being of the State.

TWO FEATURES OF THE HOME.

Let us concentrate on two features of the home which are threatened by the breaking down of the relations between parent and child. First, it is in the home that the natural affections are awakened in earliest years and developed into an habitual feature of the growing character. Lack of affection is one of the greatest blights on human character; so much so that St. Paul, when enumerating the woeful condition into which men bring themselves by deviating from the laws of morality, winds up by way of climax with the phrase *sine affectione*—without affection. Who is there that has not come across otherwise good people of such a type: hard, austere and feelingless; devoid of sympathy and incapable of entering into the feelings of others; and when you look into their antecedents, the reason is because they have been brought up in circumstances where the usual tender relations of family life were wanting.

Secondly, there will be a loss of reverence for authority, and the spirit of submission to authority. There is always a "police" element in every kind of control other than that of parents, whether the management be in the hands of servant, or nurse, or governess, or schoolmaster, or any kind of mere official. A child who obeys only because he must, or else because he likes the thing commanded, is not on the right lines for becoming a satisfactory adult. And yet the more parental relations are awakened and parental authority is diminished, the more nearly will the

adult of the coming generation approximate to this type.

In the family there are two sets of relations. The first is coordinate or between equals—the affection of brothers and sisters; the other subordinate or between unequals—the affection of children for parents. The former looks sideways, so to speak, while the latter looks upwards. On the principle of St. Ignatius that “love is shown more in deeds than in words,” one might say that brotherly (or sisterly) affection tends to issue in the spirit of service, “brother helping brother” as the saying is. From this domestic center radiates a halo to those outside. The virtue of benevolence and service which is developed at home is the foundation of that broader benevolence and service to our fellowmen in general which (in cant phrase) is called “the brotherhood of man.”

I take it that people who have not developed this spirit of brotherhood in the home when young are not likely to feel or display much of it to humanity in general after they have left home. If there is no tenderness in the character as the outcome of an early habit, acquired in surroundings where tenderness is a natural thing, it is not likely to develop much afterwards in the rough and tumble of a somewhat hard and callous world.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.

Hence I always look askance on that “spirit of service” based on “the brotherhood of man” which is practically the be-all and end-all of most of the moral instruction-lessons of the non-religious sort which I have heard and read. To those who have had a good home-training the appeal will be effective in a way, because they have learnt the habit of affection in early years, and are ready to extend it to their individual fellowmen as occasions may arise. But the abstract love of “humanity” is a figment. One can easily love this or that man if he seems in the least degree lovable; but humanity in general—Bah! What do I care for humanity? What has humanity ever done for me?

So far for the (positivist) brotherhood of man. The Christian article is quite a different thing. According to Christian teaching all men are brothers because they are all adopted children of God through Christ their elder brother, “the first born among many brethren,” who

says, "Whatsoever ye do unto the least of these my brethren, ye do it unto Me." The Christian brotherhood therefore is not merely a coordinate relation based on the fact that we are all beings of the same species. It is not even based on the fact that we are all related through Adam; for that relationship is far too remote to influence our feelings in the least. It is based on a real but supernatural family relation which is at once coordinate and subordinate—a triangular relation, so to speak, consisting first of the brotherhood of Christ, and then of the fatherhood of God.

The modern "brotherhood of man" has nothing to show for itself like this. It cannot be true brotherhood for lack of a real family relation. It can only be *camaraderie* at its highest, and easy going good-humor at its lowest, which will never effectively extend itself to humanity at large, but only to those individuals who attract and touch our emotions in some way.

Hence the modern "spirit of service" will never stand by itself. It will work only just so far as the spirit of affection has been cultivated and become habitual in the family life. If it depends solely on the natural affection of the family circle it will not go very far. Only when founded on the Christian idea of the brotherhood of Christ and the fatherhood of God will it carry us to anything like a cosmopolitan benevolence.

THE IDEA OF AUTHORITY.

We come next to the idea of authority, respect and reverence for authority, submission to authority. We often hear it said that the idea of authority is fast declining, and there is a perfectly simple explanation why this should be the case.

To come right into the heart of the subject:—Without intending a pun, we can put the whole matter in a nutshell by saying that the sole spring and source of *authority* is *authorship*. On this basis alone rests even the authority of God Himself. Because God has created us, therefore He is our Lord and Master, possessing the right to command just because everything we are and everything we have is His. Equally in the family, the sole basis of parental authority is parental authorship. Because the parent has given existence to the child, therefore he has au-

thority over the child. The child must respect, reverence and obey his parents because all that he is and has is derived from his parents.

Thus in case of God and in case of parents we have a direct and inherent ground of authority. All other so-called authority on earth is necessarily indirect and derivative or maybe merely conventional. Thus according to old-fashioned Christian ideas, the king possessed authority just because he held his power from God whose Providence he represented. Masters and employers possessed authority just so far as they were conceived as kings on a smaller scale, into whose service the employe entered for a time. Schoolmasters, nurses and governesses possessed authority only as delegates and deputies of the parents, and so on.

THE AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT.

The same notion of authority would be applicable to a modern republican government if the old-fashioned idea of the nature of government as the representative of God had survived. But this notion, in the mind of the distinctively modern man, is as dead as a door-nail. Governments nowadays do not represent God but the people; they do not derive their power from God but from the people; they are not answerable for their duties to God but to the people.

Now let us hark back to the principle that the sole source and ground of authority is authorship; and the modern man, consistently with his own theory, is at once forced to the conclusion that a modern government possesses no authority at all; nothing to command respect, reverence or submission on inherent grounds. If a citizen obeys the government it can only be either on grounds of convention, because everybody else does it, or on grounds of compulsion, that is, for fear of the police. For what is government but a mere public servant delegated by the sovereign people to manage its public affairs; to be praised or blamed, to be sustained or deposed according to the vote of the majority?

The conclusion is plain. If the basis and source of authority is authorship, there can only be two authorities in the world: God and parents. You can abolish God (in mind and practise); and that gets rid of authority number

one. Abolish parents you cannot, so there is no getting rid of authority number two. But you can by an insidious campaign so undermine the authority of parents, or remove it from sight, that the children will cease to recognize it. This can be done in two ways: first, by spoiling or breaking up the home by the various means already referred to; and secondly, by transferring the control and management of children to the Educational and Health Departments of Government, thus putting the State in place of the parents.

So it comes back again to the old fundamental truth. The family is the unit of mankind, complete and self-contained. It is the breeding ground of men, and it is also the breeding ground of all the virtues which become a man, all the virtues which are necessary for the individual, social and national life. Break up the family, separate parents and children, destroy the natural relations subsisting between them, or thwart and prevent their exercise; and whatever success you may have in bringing up a generation of citizens on lines of scientific efficiency, you will never succeed in instilling into them the sense of authority, or the spirit of reverence and submission to authority.

SUMMARY.

There are at least four conspiracies against the child in our times, some direct and some indirect:

(1) To limit the number of them coming into the world (*a*) by birth control; (*b*) by marriage control or eugenics. (2) To spoil them after they have come into the world, by undermining the home, and this in three ways:—(*a*) By easy divorce, which makes the home and family precarious; (*b*) By relegating children to nurses or servants or schools; (*c*) By flat life, club life, society distractions, and the distractions of the feminist movement breaking up the family circle. (3) Secular education lacking in ethical and religious training, which awakens the faculties without guiding them aright. (4) Substituting the State for the parents, and thus undermining the principle of authority. And all no doubt with the best intentions—the things, they say, the way to hell is paved with—and that's just the pity of it!

Church and State

THE POPE'S LETTER TO THE POLISH BISHOPS

IN the letter addressed to Us in your name by Our Beloved Son, Alexander Kakowski, Cardinal Archbishop of Warsaw. We read the report of your recent fraternal congress at the tomb of the celestial patron of Poland, St. Stanislaus.

This report has caused Us great satisfaction and We fervently beseech God to consolidate with the power of His grace the decisions you have no doubt taken in virtue of your pastoral office, for the good of the souls entrusted to your care.

In this letter you recall some of the advantages We have had the pleasure of granting the Poles; but far more important and more worthy of notice appear throughout history the proofs of the special love with which the Holy See has constantly surrounded your nation, a love intensified as the conditions of Poland became worse.

In fact, when the civil governments bowed before overpowering force imposing itself upon the rights of justice, and witnessed in dumb silence the suppression of Poland's political personality, one voice alone was raised in protestation—the voice of the Holy See. When the most sacred rights of the Polish nation were trampled upon by a tyrannical regime, the Holy See again took up publicly and privately the cause of the oppressed; and when, during the late universal conflagration, the other Powers seemed satisfied with the promise to Poland of a kind of so-called autonomy, the Holy See was alone in insisting several times on the necessity of re-establishing Poland in its ancient dignity, moral individuality, and complete independence.

Our love and forethought towards your nation, Beloved Children and Venerable Brethren, have for their only limit duty and justice.

Whenever nations differ regarding their interests, it is the duty of the Pope, equally Father to all His children, to observe strict impartiality, and not to side either with one party or the other. This traditional rule of the Roman Curia was also Ours during the Great War, and whatever may have been said to the contrary by badly intentioned

men, or at least men animated by scant respect for the Holy See, that golden rule was still Ours in the times immediately preceding the plebiscite of Upper Silesia. Should it happen, as events have several times shown, that under the excitement of human passions the laws of right are violated, the same sense of impartial justice obliges Us to reprove and condemn such violence from whatever side it comes.

Inspired by such deep love for your country, We form the most ardent wishes, and hope that Poland will overcome speedily and successfully the trials it were difficult for her not to be exposed to on resuming political life; and may she attain quickly and easily that peaceful union with the neighboring States so necessary for her prosperity. Your zeal, Beloved Children and Venerable Brethren and that of your clergy, within the boundareis of the ecclesiastical ministry, can efficaciously help to attain such an end.

BISHOPS AND THE STATE.

In Our letter, dated February 10, last, to the Belgian Bishops, We indicated which should be the line of conduct of the clergy and especially of the Bishops in political matters. Suffice it to recall its fundamental principle: As the direction of all that concerns the affairs of the State appertains to the legitimate civil powers, equally it befalls the ministers of God to keep in mind the words of the Apostle St. Paul to the Hebrews: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God." (Heb. V:1.) In such a manner each of the two powers has a limited sphere of action in which to move. In consequence, the civil power of Poland, in the interest of the public, must help the clergy in the fulfilment of their holy mission, for they would take unfair advantage of their force should they attempt to oppose this clergy, or should they dare try to settle by their sole authority the relations between citizens and God. The Bishops on their side, and all other members of the clergy of Poland, while enjoying the benefit of their civil rights like all other citizens, nevertheless as "the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries," (II. Cor. I: 1.) must not place the authority of their ministry at the service of political interests, but preaching by word and

example the observance of the law and political methods indicated by the civil authorities, must aim above all at the religious and moral training of their fellow-citizens.

Their vigilance should be intensified specially concerning Protestantism and subversive documents tending to corrupt the Faith and the morals of the nation. They will not suffer such errors to spread, but will instill everywhere the healthy orthodox doctrine, endeavoring strenuously to oppose a corrupt press by a pure one. Finally, they shall consider it their obligation, an obligation to be cherished by all who bear a sacred character, to offer the cooperation of their character to their brothers in the priesthood even should they profess different political opinions and be of different nationality and of different denomination. Such diversity, coupled with simultaneous cooperation of the two powers constantly imbued with the teachings of the Church, has never failed to produce salutary effects as well for individuals as for nations.

Hoping that Our blessing will bring forth for your country beneficial results, We give with all Our heart to you Beloved Son, to the Venerable Brethren, to your clergy, and to all your people as a pledge of Divine favors and expression of Our special benevolence, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given in Rome, near St. Peter's, on July 16, the Feast of the Commemoration of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, in the year 1921, seventh of our Pontificate.

BENEDICT PP. XV.

The Pope and Young Italy

THE HOLY FATHER'S ADDRESS TO THE SOCIETY OF
CATHOLIC YOUTH

Translation from the Boston "Pilot"

TEN lustra (fifty years) form an epoch in the lives of individuals as of societies; they suffice to make us realize the virtue of the one and to know and love the spirit of the other. With good right, therefore, the Society of Catholic Youth celebrates during these days the first jubilee of its foundation in Italy.

Of the founders of this Association one only is the fortunate survivor; of the first few associates few have survived the joys and sad vicissitudes of the past fifty years. But, on the contrary, how many Circles have been formed during this period? How many members enrolled? How the great army of Catholic youths has been formed!

If one wishes to consider the glory of any army, he looks not so much to the number of soldiers as to the frequency and importance of the enterprises performed by them. How many private and public compacts have been determined by the Society of Catholic Youth in the first ten lustra of its existence! How many religious feasts it has celebrated! How many commemorations of persons or events it has kept! How many works of public benefaction it has performed! And, above all, how many struggles it has sustained nobly! In how many battles it has taken part, for the defense of sacred rights and that religious doctrines and principles might triumph!

Therefore, We rejoice at the sight of such a vast body of Catholic Youth in Our presence, and we consider that if the present jubilee closes an epoch, it also opens a new one.

The beginning of a new epoch is a fitting time for good auguries. It is an opportune time to make wise propositions, and to gather new strength and force for that which lies ahead. So Our good wishes for this organization are all yours, beloved sons! With the greatest of affection and ardor We make them, believing that they will all be fulfilled.

The laudation of a work already done fills the heart with the desire to expand it that it may effect a still greater good. We believe that the Society of Italian Youth will, in the future, bear yet greater fruit of good works.

Your society, beloved sons, should aim principally toward the formation of the morals and religious education of new generations. If in every age souls have made a ready and beautiful profession of the Faith, in these days particularly there is need of courage which shall make us eager to proclaim ourselves Catholics, and to live in private as in public, as the Catholic religion teaches us to live, that we may obtain so many more rewards of virtue

through the trials and struggles which we must undergo, fighting beneath the standard of Christ.

We know well that young men especially are apt to be drawn away from an open confession of their Faith through the fear of displeasing their companions, or of compromising their future. But the members of the Society of Catholic Youth are resolved to conquer human respect in the occasions that arise every day. Blessed indeed is the Society capable of forming men of character in an epoch when it requires courage to defend holy doctrines and principles of living! It would indeed mean little if men were to live according to the Faith in their private lives, and on the great public platform, should remain silent when the occasion arises for proclaiming themselves truly Catholic. It is the great work of youth to defend the right of God and the Church against the assaults of the world.

The liveliness and sincerity of your filial devotion are fully proved by this demonstration, beloved sons! Not distance nor difficulties of a long and tedious journey, not the uncertainties attendant upon housing or any other motives have contributed to prevent you from coming to the Tomb of the Great Prince of the Apostles, and exhibiting your spirit of piety on the spots where martyrs suffered in the arena of the Coliseum. May We prophesy that the youths of the twentieth century will prove worthy of the example of the youths of the Coliseum, the Christians of the primitive age? There will be only this difference: that you will not be forced to hide in the Catacombs, but will stand in the public amphitheater. You will come forth gladly to contest, not with the lions of the Coliseum, but with the lions of human respect.

The efficacy of your promises, beloved sons, We confide to the protection of the Most Holy Virgin. Before her venerable image, you have renewed your protestation to stand always with Holy Mother, Church, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Your pact is as solemn as it is lofty. You should have every confidence that the White Queen of the Pyrenees with her powerful intercession will make the way clear, because she is not alone a powerful, but a loving Mother.